

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-18 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 1 has been herein amended and no new matter is added.

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeglinski (4,425,777) in view of Rooney (5,144,709).

In response to the arguments in the Amendment filed October 21, 2005, the Examiner posited

“while it is true that the circular aperture 50 is formed prior to the forming of the deformation absorbers 66 and 72, it is clearly shown in Figure 2 of Rooney that the plastic working (deforming) for forming the recesses 85 are formed after the formation of the deformation absorbers 66 and 72 (see Station B in Figure 2). The fact that the aperture 50 is formed prior to the formation of the deformation absorber 66 and 72 is really a moot point because the critical feature, both claimed and illustrated by Rooney, involves the "plastic working" (in Rooney, this is the deformation that produces the recess 85) after the deformation absorbers are produced.” (Office Action, pages 3 and 4)

Applicant traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of the claims as set forth below. Of the rejected claims, claim 1 is the only independent claim. Claim 1 requires:

wherein the step of providing the deformation absorber is performed before any plastic working is performed in the first region

Applicant submits it is clear that the combined teachings of Rooney and Jeglinski fail to teach or suggest that the step of providing the deformation absorber is performed before any plastic working is performed in the first region, as recited in claim 1.

Particularly, as noted by the Examiner, circular aperture 50 is formed prior to forming deformation absorbers 66 and 72, in Rooney. If, *arguendo*, recess 85 is formed in the “first region”, then circular aperture 50 would have been formed in the “first region” too. However, deformation absorbers 66 and 72 are not formed when the plastic working for circular aperture 50 is completed. Even though recess 85 is formed after deformation absorbers 66 and 72 are formed, plastic working is performed in the “first region” prior to forming the deformation absorbers. In essence, it is clear that the above-identified teachings of Rooney go against the unique features recited in claim 1. Therefore, Rooney and Jeglinski fail to teach or suggest the step of providing the deformation absorber before any plastic working is performed in the first region, as recited in claim 1. Even when taken as a whole for what they would have meant to a skilled artisan, the combined teachings of Rooney and Jeglinski do not render unpatentable claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-4 and 6-11.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No. 10/644,088

Attorney Docket No. Q77070

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 13, 2006